The Artist Rāñjhā and A Dated Set of Rāmayaṇa Drawings

Nearly thirty years ago, Rai Krishnadasa bought from Radhakrishna Bharany,[1] that antique dealer whose hauls of Pahari painting have become a near legend, a set of drawings of the *Rāmāyaṇa* for Bharat Kala Bhavan, Banaras.[2] He bought it at a price which also sounds almost legendary now: for the whole set which consisted of more than 700 drawings in sanguine, each measuring on the average 14.4×10 inches, he paid a price which works out to the figure of about ten annas for each drawing! The set was nearly intact: out of 707 drawings Mr. Bharany had brought 702. Each of the sheets had text in Hindi written or pasted at the back.[3] Many leaves carried notes, on the borders of the drawings or at the back, evidently in the hand of the artist who executed this splendid series. What is more, the last sheet of the set had on its reverse a detailed colophon in Sanskrit giving the names of the artist and his patron, the place of painting, the date of its execution, and the name of the pandit who composed the text.

Ten years ago, Mr. Karl Khandalavala published a brief notice of the set in his *Pahārī Miniature Painting*.[4] He cited the bare facts listed in the colophon and made a terse comment saying that this set of drawings helped us in knowing something of the decline of drawing in Kangra art in the early 19th century. In the work he saw evidence of the fact that at this time "the earlier emphasis on delicacy of outline was on the wane", even though he thought that "the technique was fairly sure and free".

For historians of Pahari painting who cast about eagerly looking for the foundation of

[1] With Mr. Radhakrishna Bharany, who came from Amritsar, are associated the beginnings of interest in Pahari painting by collectors. It was he who, together with Mr. Popli, supplied paintings and drawings to most collectors, including Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy. Much of the information regarding the sources and the styles of Pahari painting also came from these dealers. In the process of draining the hills of these paintings, Mr. Bharany made a fortune for himself and his success led to many members of his family founding independent antique-shops at Calcutta, Delhi and Amritsar. The beginnings of Mr. Bharany's dealings in Pahari paintings were humble and Rai Krishnadasa narrates as to how he used to carry stacks of these pictures on his shoulder and offer them for sale at flat and incredibly low rates (sometimes five rupees per painting) for *any* Basohli and Kangra miniature.

[2] The set of drawings in the Kala Bhavan bears continuous Accession numbers from 2001 to 2702. I am deeply indebted to Rai Krishnadasa for his kind help which has made much of my study possible. He is full of the most fascinating information about the activities of antique-dealers, the situation of Pahari paintings when they had just begun to attract general attention, and the manner in which most collections, public or private, were built up. And he gives generously of this information. It was in January 1966 that I first saw the *Rāmāyaṇa* set and it was then that I gathered most of this information orally from Rai Ji.

[3] This circumstance needs to be mentioned here because the fact that the colophon is on a piece of *sialkoti* paper which has been pasted on the back of the last drawing which bears Acc. No. 2702, Lest this should cause any doubt to arise about the contemporaneity of the colophon with the set, it may be mentioned that the text of the back of several drawings is also pasted in a similar manner. See, for example, Acc. No. 2338. A possible explanation of this is that these broad strips carry corrected versions of the text on top of which they have been pasted.

[4] See page 256.

facts, however small, the thing of foremost interest naturally is the colophon which reads thus:

Rāmarshi vasu Bhū Sankhye Vikramāditya Vatsare
Shrāvaṇasyāsite Pakshe Saptamyām Budhavāsare 1
Bisohlī nagarī madhye rājyaṁ shāsati rājanī
Shrimad Bhūpendra Pālendre dvijendre kulanandane 2
Sudershanen viduṣā Kāshmireṇ yathā mati
Rāmāyaṇasya bhāsheyaṁ chitra bhāva prabandhitā 3
Rāñjhākhya chitrakasyārthe tena chitrī kṛitārthitā
Kṛitā satpātu Rāmen Rāmāyaṇa kathā yathā 4
Tāriṇī dukhsansārād suddoshādapi hāriṇī
Astu Shrī Saukhya dīrghāyu Jagannmangalkāriṇī 5

This, rendered freely, would read in English as:

> "In the Vikrama Samvat, calculated by[5] Rāma (3) Rishi (7), Vasu (8) and Bhu (1) (i.e. 1873=A.D. 1816), in the dark half of the month of Śrāvaṇa, on Wednesday the 7th:
> In the town of Basohli, during the reign of Shri Raja Bhupendra Pāl, the learned Sudarśan, born in the family of Kashmiri (Brahmins), composed, according to his best understanding, this *bhāshā* of the (Vālmīki) *Rāmāyaṇa*, for being visually rendered into paintings.[6] He composed this *bhāshā* for the artist Rāñjhā who gave visual form to the verses. This rendering of the *Kathā* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is blessed by Rāma himself: it enables all to cross the world of misery, and absolves them of a multitude of sins. May (this *bhāshā*) be conducive to the prosperity, happiness, long life, and well-being of the whole world!"

The importance of the information contained in the colophon is obvious, especially because even small snatches of facts of this sort are rarely come by in Pahari painting. Mr. Khandalavala, however, did not pay excessive attention to the set and declined to pursue the information it gave beyond a point. He was not very surprised about the drawings being in the Kangra style because there was other evidence that in the early nineteenth century the "Kangra kalam had displaced the old Basohli school even in the home of its origin." As for the artist Rāñjhā, he dismissed him lightly because he felt that this Rāñjhā was "not likely to be the son of Nainsukh" of the Guler family of artists, about whom and whose ancestry we knew

[5] This manner of calculation of dates, by inserting specific words instead of digits, was commonly employed in Sanskrit colophon. A more or less parallel practice is that employed in Persian where chronograms in the *abjad* manner were frequently composed by inventive writers. In Sanskrit chronograms, after the digits had been obtained by decoding the words, they were to be reversed. In the present case, the digits that are obtained in order to yield the figure 3781, which when reversed, comes to 1873 which is the Vikrami year of the composition. The colophons on the 1730 *Gīta-Govinda* and the 1694-95 *Rasamañjarī* sets contain dates woven into verses in a similar manner. See Hirananda Shastri, *Indian Pictorial Art as Developed in Book Illustrations* (Baroda, 1936), pl. 6 and Karl Khandalavala, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

[6] The expression in the text is "*chitra bhāva prabandhitā*," which I have thus rendered. There may be many ways of translating this expression, but the rendering that I have given is keeping in view the general practice followed by *paṇḍits* and painters, in the hills. The composition was entirely made by the painter while the text was literally interpreted, or composed, by the *paṇḍit*.

a little even then. At that moment, we can now see Rāñjhā, narrowly missed becoming famous.

But this has been the fate of Rāñjhā: he had even earlier been both misplaced and questionably identified. Mr. Khandalavala's obvious reasons for not taking the artist of this *Rāmāyaṇa* series from Basohli to be the same person as the son of Nainsukh were that his date sounded too late. He did not wish to see in Rāñjhā, in the witty but unjust phrase of Mr. Douglas Barrett, another "Titian of the Hills."[7] The date does clearly appear to be late for a son of Nainsukh to be actively working, considering that we have dated pictures by Nainsukh belonging to the forties of the eighteenth century.[8] Mr. Khandalavala also must have found it difficult to take this person to be Rāñjhā, son of Nainsukh, because he had earlier[9] equated Rāñjhā with Rām Lāl and placed him in the court of Raja Raj Singh of Chamba (1764-1794).

It now seems that the Rāñjhā of this *Rāmāyaṇa* series was none else than the son of Nainsukh, no alternative theory withstanding. The colophon does not mention the descent of Rāñjhā but we have definitive information from other sources. In the *bahis* or pilgrim registers kept at Kurukshetra and Haridwar,[10] I have come upon entries relating directly to Rāñjhā. Rāñjhā states himself in the entry in a priests' *bahi* at Kurukshetra, and then confirms it in an entry made five days later at Haridwar,[11] that he came on pilgrimage from Basohli, even though he refers to Guler as his "place of origin". He gives his descent very clearly and mentions the names of his father and grandfather as Nainsukh and Seu, names with which we are only too familiar. Any chances that the Rāñjhā of this *Rāmāyaṇa* set might yet be another person are taken care of by the date of the entries by Rāñjhā. He wrote these in S. 1884 (= A.D. 1827) which works out to eleven years after 1816, the year in which the *Rāmāyaṇa* drawings were finished. If Rāñjhā, son of Nainsukh, was alive in 1827, and living in Basohli, it is reasonable to conclude that he was also alive in 1816, and was living in Basohli.

But from the date at which his father Nainsukh was actively working, it appears to be almost certain that in 1816 Rāñjhā must have been an old man. The 1827 entries somehow have the breath of old age about them. Apart from the direct evidence of his advanced years —Rāñjhā came on this pilgrimage accompanied by his two sons, Gursahāi and Sukh Dayāl, and brought the ashes of his daughter-in-law, Gursahāi's wife—there is a feeling about the phrases used by Rāñjhā that is distinctly suggestive of his being then a very, very old man. The occasion of Rāñjhā's visit was a long pilgrimage on which "he was being taken," he says, by

[7] Mr. Barrett uses this in connection with Manaku about whose career and age several speculations have been made. The advanced age at which Rāñjhā clearly turned out the present set should clearly bring a 'Titian of the Hills' within the range of possibility.

[8] There is a picture of Balwant Singh in the Chandigarh Museum (No. D-130) which is dated A.D. 1743. The famous Balwant Singh listening to music by Nainsukh bears the date A.D. 1748.

[9] See Khandalavala, *op. cit.*, pp. 266-268. I have discussed the Rāñjhā vs. Rām Lāl reading in my "A Re-reading of Some Takri Inscriptions in Khandalavala's Pahari Miniature Painting," *Roopalekhā*, No. XXXV, Nos. 1 & 2.

[10] I have drawn heavily upon this important source of information for a reconstruction of the genealogies of Pahari artists. For a general introduction to these records, see B. N. Goswamy "The Records kept by Priests at Centres of Pilgrimage as a Source of Social and Economic History," *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, Vol. III, No. 2, June, 1966.

[11] These entries occur in the *bahis* of Pandit Hari Bilās at Kurukshetra and Sardar Rām Rakhā at Haridwar, to whom I am very grateful for permission to consult their records. The Kurukshetra entry which I have reproduced *in extenso* in the forthcoming issue of the *Marg* in which I have reconstructed the genealogy and the style of the Seu-Manak-Nainsukh family suggests that the settlement of this branch of family dated from the time of Rājā Amrit Pāl (1757-1776). I am inclined to believe that Nainsukh himself settled here at Basohli after taking up employment with Amrit Pāl.

his two sons, to the holy cities of Banaras and Gaya for the sake of the "peace of the departed souls of his ancestors." One almost visualizes this as being the last of his pilgrimages, undertaken as a final meritorious act by an old man in the evening of his life.

Even when Rāñjhā completed the *Rāmāyaṇa* set of drawings, in 1816, more than a decade earlier than this pilgrimage, he seems to have been old. The fact that he did not take the drawings beyond the stage of *namūnās*[12] or "original sketches" with a *sindhuri kalam* may well have been due to Rāñjhā finding himself without the energy or the patience to embark upon the stupendous task of finishing a set of more than 700 paintings. What Rāñjhā seems to have done here is that he added an extensive series of sketches to the family collection, and felt content with leaving for his sons a veritable treasure of compositions to draw upon.

In these sketches he gave freely of himself and his obvious gift, but he was not producing "drawings" of the kind that were to be taken through various stages and turned into finished paintings. For that kind of drawing a much steadier hand was needed than could perhaps be commanded by Rāñjhā in his old age. So, it appears, he did the next best thing to leaving a set of fine drawings; he turned out a set of free hand sketches from which drawings and then paintings could be prepared. Because Rāñjhā was simply preparing sketches, he often entered detailed notes in the margins of the drawings for the guidance of his successors. Repeatedly in these notes, he assumes that complete pictures will be made by his sons, basing their work on these free sketches. The instructions he gives relate clearly to the preparation of a finished set. Where he wishes two or three pictures of nearly the same theme or composition to be made, he simply indicates that this should be done and does not himself make these two or three drawings. All this would have been wholly unnecessary, had he at any stage felt that he himself would turn out complete pictures. Perhaps he thought that neither time nor age were on his side.

To me personally the importance of this set of drawings lies in its being the only signed set by a member of the family of Pandit Seu, in the generation next to that of Mānak and Nainsukh. We have the names of Fattu, Khushalā, Kama, Gaudhu, and Nikkā,[13] and speculate about their style and places of work but it is this set alone which is signed and dated in a manner which is wholly credible. As such it affords us invaluable evidence about the style of this family of artists which I believe has given to us the great sets of the 'Kangra' manner, including the Garhwal *Gīta-Govinda*, the Modi *Bhāgavata* now in the National Museum, the Garhwal *Sat Sai*, the National Museum collection *Rāgamālā*, and even the *Nala-Damayanti* from Dr. Karan Singh's collection which I have elsewhere[14] ascribed to Rāñjhā himself. None of these well-known sets is signed or dated with the doubtful exception of the Garhwal *Gīta-Govinda*, doubtful because the colophon it carries seems to have been inexplicably copied from an earlier *Gīta-Govinda* set dated 1730 and painted in the hot, primitive manner.[15] The Rāñjhā *Rāmāyaṇa* acquires then new importance, when seen from this angle.

[12] The word "*namūnā*" to mean original sketches was used by the Mughal artists also. See Moti Chandra, *The Technique of Mughal Painting*, (Lucknow, 1949), p. 39. The *namūnās*, I am told by the artist Chandu Lal Raina of Rājol, were always kept in the family collection and were different from *khākās* which were actually worked upon and turned into finished pictures. Most of the *khākās* were drawings in a black outline.

[13] See Khandalavala, *Pahāri Miniature Painting*, pp. 327-335. I have reconstructed the complete genealogy of this family in my forthcoming essay in the *Marg*.

[14] See B. N. Goswamy, "Pahari Paintings of the *Nala-Damayanti* Theme: Discussion in a New Light," scheduled to be published in the M. S. Randhawa Presentation volume of *Roopalekhā*, in February, 1969.

[15] See W. G. Archer's introduction to M. S. Randhawa's *Kangra Paintings of the Gita Govinda* (New Delhi 1963), for a discussion of the problem of these two colophons.

It is a little unnecessary to dwell at length here upon the style of this artist family, because I have already drawn attention to it elsewhere.[16] But in this set we have corroborative evidence of the enormous facility in drawing and boldness in composition which we associate with the work of this family. The drawings of Rāñjhā, however swiftly sketched, breathe with vitality. The brush that he wielded seems simply to have glided upon surfaces and one marvels again and again at the strange combination of restraint and freedom in his line. I do not see in it anywhere that tendency to slovenliness where the compositions were complicated, as Mr. Khandalavala says.[17] If there are occasional signs of haste they are to be ascribed to the fact that Rāñjhā was here merely *suggesting*, as it were, compositions: drawing architectural details, placing figures, delineating actions. He was not really preparing *khākās* or fine drawings that in themselves were to be worked on and completed in the form of paintings. The compositions of Rāñjhā far from being slovenly, are at once controlled and well-conceived. In these drawings we encounter the features that we are familiar with from the other work of members of this family referred to above. We have here the same fluid naturalism, the same pre-occupation with the treatment of space, and the same attempts at linear perspective. If there is not an equal amount of concern with individual character, it is because the faces are not always recognizable and no portraiture in these sketches has understandably even been attempted. We encounter again and again, on the other hand, here as elsewhere, devices and arrangements like rows of heads of persons appearing above diagonal walls, the subtle groupings of characters in groups; the loggia, the treatment of trees, night, fire, even the decorative patterns on the upper edge of a *kanāt*, or cloth-screen, which are instantaneously recognizable.

It is possible occasionally to recognize whole parts of compositions in this set that one has seen elsewhere. The dancers in the court of Rāvaṇa (Acc. No. 2534) recall to one's mind the dancers entertaining young Raj Singh of Chamba;[18] the bathing scene in which the four brothers are to be seen taking baths surrounded by *kanāts* (Acc. No. 2523) immediately suggest Nala at his ablutions from the set of *Nala-Damayanti* drawings;[19] the crowd in the scene where a palanquin carried by four *kahārs* or bearers comes in (Acc. No. 2501) again leads one to a *Nala-Damayanti* drawing.[20] The chambers full of men and women (Acc. Na. 2178) one has seen several times in the *Nala-Damayanti* set; the manner in which several persons appear barely visible above a diagonal wall (Acc. No. 2167) is closely linked to the picture of Goverdhan Chand of Guler listening to music.[21] The treatment of the sky at night (Acc. No. 2387) is the same as in the painting of a Raja inspecting the points of a horse by torchlight;[22] the figures in a *howdah* on the back of an elephant (Acc. No. 2665) have much earlier parallels in the series of Guler rulers on elephant back;[23] the fire in Lanka (Acc. No. 2391) could only have been painted by someone who was familiar with the *Bhāgavata* painting of the house of the Pāṇḍavas on fire.[24] There is also an engaging parallel between the chariot

[16] In my essay on the style of this family, see note 11 above.
[17] *Pahāri Miniature Painting*, p. 256.
[18] Reproduced in *Pahari Miniature Painting*, fig. 87.
[19] Reproduced in Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, *Catalogue of Indian Collections in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* Part V: Rajput Painting (Boston, 1926), pl. xlix (a).
[20] *Ibid.*, pl. xxxix.
[21] Reproduced in M. S. Randhawa, *Kangra Valley Paintings* (Delhi, 1954), pl. 1.
[22] Reproduced in W. G. Archer, *Indian Painting in the Punjab Hills* (London, 1952), pl. 43.
[23] This series is at present in the Chandigarh Museum and was acquired from the Raja of Guler.
[24] See George Lawrence, *Paintings of the Himalayan States* (London, 1963), pl. 10.

of Rāma (Acc. No. 2473) with the hurried drawing made in 1827 by Rāñjhā in his own hand in the *bahi* of the Kurukshetra priest, representing Kṛishṇa on his chariot delivering the sermon to Arjuna.[25] If there are not many striking similarities between any of these drawings and the *Gita-Govinda* pictures, it is possibly because the artist here does not get much occasion to delineate a lush foliage with tenderness as the backdrop of a divine-human passion. But even so there are general similarities in the treatment of the landscape in the *Gita-Govinda* and the *Bhāgavata* sets and a drawing in which Rāvaṇa violates Rambhā in natural surroundings (Acc. No. 2616).

The evidence of this series on the family style apart, what is full of such fascination for the art historian also is the information that the set yields on the technique of Pahari painting. The co-operation between a learned *paṇḍit* and a painter in the preparation of sets of paintings is often spoken of,[26] but here we see this in active practice. The author of the *bhāshā*, Paṇḍit Sudarśan, states explicitly in the colophon that he rendered these verses with the idea of their being "visually rendered into paintings", meaning perhaps that he concentrated upon passages and divided his text over various sheets in a manner in which the artist could "bind" or interpret the verses in terms of a single visual image. The artist Rāñjhā himself seems to have worked under the guidance of Paṇḍit Sudarśan in understanding the precise spirit of the situations, but then what is interesting is that he has added his own, very brief but explanatory, notes about the situation in the painting in his own dialect in some cases.[27] This he seems clearly to have done to ensure that the person who was to complete the pictures does not miss the *bhāva* or the essence of the dramatic situation.

It has sometimes been a matter of some doubt or speculations as to who precisely made the colour and pattern notes on the drawings, or inscribed occasional instructions on *khākās*. There are, as I see it, three possibilities. One, that these notes were made by the master artist for the guidance of his disciples who completed the pictures. Two, that these notes were in the nature of memory-aids, having been made by the artist himself for future use, from pictures which he had finished but of which he kept the *khākās* with himself for future use. Finally, that these notes were based on a finished painting which the artist saw elsewhere and from which he made an occasional copy. In the present case, there is little doubt that the instructions on the drawings were given by Rāñjhā himself and were in the nature of notes addressed to him who was to work from these *namūnās*. This appears to be very clear from a drawing from the *Bāla Kāṇḍa* (Acc. No. 2152). The note on the back ends with the words "*Rājadhānī ke jharokhe mem Rāniān linkhiān. Yagya kī, ḍere kī, nishāni likhnī*". This would mean, in translation: "In the balconies (of the palaces) of the capital city, paint the Ranis (looking down). Add appropriate details for the sacrificial fire and for the camp." Clearly, Rāñjhā left it to his successors, if they were to paint the set, to incorporate them. This, it appears, must have been so routine a matter in the family that he found it unnecessary to delineate these details precisely.

[25] I have reproduced the sheet bearing Rāñjhā's entry and drawing in my essay in the *Mārg*.

[26] Shri Chandu Lal Raina of Rajol and the late Shri Gulabu Ram of Samloti were consistently of the view that the *paṇḍit* recited and interpreted the texts and the painter cast them into visual form. The texts at the back of the pictures were also inscribed by the *paṇḍit* rather than the painter.

[27] Thus, in the drawing No. 2177, a note at the back, which is in addition to the text of the *bhāshā*, says: "*praṇām kiyā, gal mile, saādhī āongā, aise kahā*," meaning "(They) bowed, embraced, and said 'we will return soon'."

At the back of the drawing showing the conversation between Daśaratha and the sage Vasishṭha (Acc. No. 2129), a note says "*Tiyār karnā tāṇ chitra do karne*," meaning: "When this is 'prepared', then make two pictures (of this very subject)." This instruction appears to be a little ambiguous in its meaning at first but the note acquires both significance and meaning when we come upon a similar note in a drawing showing conversation between Rāvaṇa and Hanumān who, tied up, has been brought to him as a captive by the Rākshasas. The note on the margin here says: "*Chitra do karne, bhāva ik, samvād kā*", meaning "Prepare two pictures (of this subject); the *bhāva* of both the pictures is the same; (the idea is to show) a conversation." We have here a wonderful insight into the manner in which the passage of time, in a prolonged conversation, is to be indicated: two pictures of precisely the same theme are to be painted. We find a similar note on a drawing in which Rāvaṇa is engaged in a conversation with Sahasrārjuna in the *Uttara Kāṇḍa* (Acc. No. 2631). The instruction here is that three pictures of this very theme are to be prepared. In another drawing, we get an eloquent note: "*Tiyār karnā tāṇ sūraj dūr numā likhnā*," meaning, "When you prepare the picture, show the sun far in the distance." The meaning of this instruction becomes apparent when we consider that the drawing treats of the episode from the *Uttara Kāṇḍa* in which the mighty Hanumān flies towards the sun, distant in the sky, to swallow it, in the belief that it is an edible fruit. One notices the use of the Persian expression, *dūr numā* meaning "appearing far in the distance," much as one noticed the word '*namūnā*' being used for these sketches.

At the back of one of the sketches (Acc. No. 2303) is some interesting information about quantities of colours. In this list we get some names of the colours:[28] *supedā* (zinc-white), *sīndhura* (vermilion), *piyorī* (yellow, from the cow's urine), *sangraf* (cinnabar-red), *jangāl* (verdigris), *varak sune de* (gold leaves); and *rupe de varak* (silver leaves). We do not know what these notes really signify and it has not been possible for me to decipher the exact quantities of the colours indicated here, except of the gold and silver leaves which are given as sixteen and thirty in numbers, but if it is any indication of the estimate of the quantity of colours that might have been needed for the execution of the series, this note acquires more interest and significance.

From Mr. Bharany who sold this set to Bharat Kala Bhavan, no definite information could be gained, as was to be expected, about the source from which he had brought this large series, virtually intact. But there is an interesting bit of intrinsic information which I should like to mention in the end. At the back of one of the drawings (Acc. No. 2536) a small slip of faded green paper has been pasted to support the sheet at a point where it had weakened. This little slip was obviously pasted at a late date, and was torn from some ordinary paper in the possession of the owner of the set: on it is written the fragment of a sentence in Persian script, "*(Bra)hmin; pesha nasavvari az Patiālā*," meaning: "(Bra)hmin; occupation painting; resident at Patiala." The slip appears to have been torn from a sheet of official or semi-official nature in which the name and parentage, caste, occupation, and place of residence of a person, as is required in many official documents, must have been entered. I am inclined to think that on this paper might well have been, in the original, an entry relating to a member of the family who described himself in these terms. This becomes plausible when

[28] For a list of the colours used by Pahari painters, see Khandalavala, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-273. Also see B. N. Goswamy, "The Technique of Pahari Painting: A Discussion of Colour and Pattern Notes," *East and West*, Vol. 17, Nos. 3-4.

we remember that the family of artists to which Rāñjhā belonged treated itself as Brahmins. It is fascinating to relate this information to our knowledge of the movements of Deviditta, grandson of Rāñjhā, who had shifted from Basohli first to Lahore and then to the Patiala court. He was resident at Patiala in the fifties of the 19th century.[28]

It appears that the sketches of Rāñjhā were never used by his descendants. From him they passed first to his son Gursahāi, from whom, I imagine, they passed on to *his* son, Deviditta. But they always remained in the state in which Rāñjhā had left them. Perhaps Gursahāi did not find continued patronage at Basohli; or it may have been that Deviditta found it more useful to spend his time on painting Sikh Sardars striking heroic postures and Phulkian chiefs riding on caparisoned steeds. The *Rāmāyaṇa* sketches stayed as they were, with all the instructions intact but unheeded. But then perhaps Rāñjhā's assumptions about what was to come after him were wrong.

[28] I have discussed the migrations of Deviditta at length in the *Mārg* essay. Also see B. N. Goswamy "Pahari Painting: A Study in the Patronage of the Arts by the State," *Proceedings of the Seminar on the Medieval Indian State*, Chandigarh 1967.